

**Preparations
for the Duties of Life:
Women Reformers
and the Functional Curriculum,
1893-1918**

By Christine Woyshner

At the turn of the twentieth century women in voluntary associations joined the chorus of voices that sought to rework the school curriculum from an emphasis on the liberal arts to a functional, more practical focus. In 1900 one activist explained that the members of the major women's organizations "have regarded their children *first of all as future mothers and fathers*, next as citizens, and they are demanding that public educational systems adopt their standards of values in the adjustment of curricula."¹ These reformers comprised one group that became invested in the curriculum debates that followed the National Education Committee of Ten's report of 1893. However, women reformers are an under-researched influence on the school curriculum of this time period, their efforts having been eclipsed by myriad historical studies of the male professional leaders. Their activ-

Christine Woyshner is an assistant professor of education at Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Preparations for the Duties of Life

ism merits a closer look, in part to help us frame more recent endeavors to feminize the school curriculum, and also to understand the range of forces that brought about the change to the more practically oriented course of study.

Since the women's movement of the 1970s, feminist researchers have called for a reworking of the curriculum, a shift in focus in schools that challenges traditional subject disciplines and draws in from the fray alternative forms of knowledge. For instance, Jane Roland Martin calls for schools to become more like homes in the sense that they should make more permeable the boundaries that separate parenting from teaching, and care work from academic pursuits.² Likewise, Nel Noddings has issued a clarion call to infuse the school curriculum with a caring approach that takes into consideration the needs, backgrounds, and desires of all students.³ Each of these calls and others turns a gendered lens onto the school curriculum and seeks to challenge the status quo of the structure and function of schooling. The successes and implementation of such calls remain to be seen, as tracing the influence of ideas to how they are made manifest in schools can be challenging. A historical glimpse, however, can offer a view of what has transpired when such proposals were launched in the past. While it is critical to note that one must be careful in facile applications of past lessons to today's context, it remains important to have an understanding of historical antecedents that can shape future curriculum reform efforts.

Just as the women's movement of the 1970s brought about a reappraisal of the school curriculum, an earlier movement at the turn of the twentieth century was led by municipal reformers who sought to remake the curriculum around care work and the goals and activities of parenting. This study examines that movement in order to shed light on more recent calls to feminize the curriculum. It asks how women sought to shape the school curriculum during what is arguably the major curriculum shift to have taken place in the United States: the transition from an emphasis on the liberal arts to a more functional, or useful, curriculum. The history of education scholarship has detailed the influence of the newly developing social sciences and scientific thinking in the debates among various thinkers and interest groups to replace the focus on humanities with tracks of learning that would prepare workers for an industrial society.⁴ Existing historical studies rely largely on the papers of various professional associations, most notably the National Education Association, that represent the ideas of male intellectual leaders such as Charles Eliot, Herbert Spencer, G. Stanley Hall, and William Torrey Harris, among others.⁵ This historical account raises questions about findings in curriculum history; it investigates what women reformers wanted during this sea change in the course of study while it adheres to the admonition that we cannot just add women to the historical narrative without reshaping current interpretations.⁶

Therefore, by viewing this major period of transition through the goals of women reformers, curriculum becomes more than a list of prescribed courses to include the broader function of schools as socializing institutions. I argue that women reformers played a pivotal role in shaping the school curriculum by

interpreting and popularizing the writings of leading male educators and social scientists. In so doing, they helped shape the goals and purposes of education, in one sense by lobbying for changes in the formal course of study, and in large part by helping to remake schools into social welfare institutions through their volunteer efforts. The white, middle-class women reformers who led major national organizations during the Progressive era sought to bring the work of childrearing into schools in order to create a better society and as early as 1900 they were steadfast in working toward that goal through the public schools.⁷ We have much more to learn about educational reformers outside of professional roles who saw in the school curriculum the means to shape families and society.⁸

During the Progressive era, a powerful national network of women's groups exerted influence from town to city around the United States. Women in local clubs directed by state and national leaders of federated associations met regularly to address common concerns around parenting and sought to reform local public schools as an extension of the role of mothering and their commitment to municipal housekeeping.⁹ This study uses the papers of various women's organizations, in particular the publications of the early PTA, the National Congress of Mothers (NCM), to explore how women reformers of the Progressive era orchestrated national voluntary efforts to remake the school curriculum according to gendered ideals.¹⁰ The PTA originated in 1897 as a one-time national meeting to promote the latest in social science research regarding the welfare of children in home, school, and society. As a result of its immediate popular success, the PTA became incorporated as a national association in 1898 and continued its child-welfare work over the course of the twentieth century. The association had the attention of the American public, several successive American presidents, and the cooperation of women volunteers around the country. It was one of several major women's organizations to lead the Department of Women's Organizations of the NEA during the 1910s. Historians of education recently have begun to explore the role of clubwomen in shaping educational institutions, curriculum, professional standards, and auxiliary services. As educational historian William J. Reese argues, during the Progressive era clubwomen "influenced every important administrative change, curricular reform, and social service established in local cities."¹¹

This article is organized into two sections. The first section traces the ideological notions regarding the functional curriculum from late-nineteenth century scholars to a leading reformer and leader of the PTA. It outlines the educational philosophy of PTA founder, Alice McLellan Birney, to serve as an example of the way women reformers interpreted theorists' standpoints to their own educational ends. Herbert Spencer and G. Stanley Hall, two leading developmentalists of the late nineteenth century whose notions about the functional curriculum eventually won out over a humanist public school curriculum in the twentieth century, provided the main inspiration to Birney's thinking. I argue that Birney interpreted their writings according to her own goals for women's education that included valuing

Preparations for the Duties of Life

women's roles as mothers in an effort to rework the school curriculum to value childrearing. Birney, therefore, represents many women reformers like her who sought to bring parenting, in particular mothering, into the school curriculum. In the second section I examine how the philosophy of the PTA, as a major women's association of the Progressive period, was translated into practice in the school curriculum. The influence of women volunteers, under the leadership of a network of women's associations, worked to support women's nurturing role in the curriculum by implementing health reforms, promoting organized motherhood, and instituting kindergartens as a form of social meliorism. What resulted was a view of a feminized curriculum that the work of raising children to make for a better society was to be the core of the school curriculum inasmuch as it sought to reinforce traditional gender roles.

Ideology of the Feminized Curriculum

Curricular changes are brought about just as much by external forces—social, political, and economic trends and the machinations of interest groups and laypersons—as they are the product of professional direction. In the last decade of the nineteenth century, various educators and interest groups began to rethink the school curriculum during a time when the role of schooling radically changed. Amid the brisk pace of industrialism, immigration, and urbanization, schools were transformed to become “mediating institutions between” the family and society.¹² In a rapidly changing social order, there was little agreement on the knowledge that should be imparted in public schools. Questions about what knowledge was of most worth and how to reshape the school curriculum according to this knowledge were central in curriculum discussions of this era.

The question of worthy knowledge was first posed by sociologist Herbert Spencer and later applied to the school curriculum by psychologist G. Stanley Hall. In large part, Hall's notions were popularized in public schools through a voluntary network of women's clubs. In the mid-nineteenth century, Herbert Spencer applied Darwinian thought to the development of knowledge and social relationships. His 1859 essay “What Knowledge is of Most Worth?” triggered a revolution in thinking about the school curriculum as it challenged the idea of a liberal arts education.¹³ Spencer's notions about the functional goals of school curriculum first made waves in his native England before it entered American educational parlance in the late nineteenth century. By the early twentieth century Spencer's functional criteria for the development of curriculum was a major revolution in that it did not follow selecting the “great cultural resources of Western culture,” but instead focused on life experience as the basis for determining what was worth knowing, and therefore teaching.¹⁴ Spencer outlined five criteria that categorized the leading life activities that were to determine school curriculum:

1. those activities which directly minister to self-preservation;

2. those activities which, by securing the necessities of life, indirectly minister to self-preservation;
3. those activities which have for their end the rearing and discipline of offspring;
4. those activities which are involved in the maintenance of proper social and political relations;
5. those miscellaneous activities which fill up the leisure part of life, devoted to the gratification of tastes and feelings.¹⁵

For Spencer, what was ornamental was less valuable than the practical, thereby positioning education as having a use beyond itself, for a future life. This contrasted with the liberal arts, which emphasized learning for its own sake or to develop particular mental faculties.

In the decades to come, professional and layperson alike deliberated Spencer's revolutionary line of reasoning. According to Kliebard, his doctrine influenced the American curriculum in three ways. First, it placed the sciences in a more prominent position in the secondary school curriculum. Next, it positioned curriculum as a "reflection of natural laws governing both the course of human history and the development of the individual." Finally, Spencer's philosophy altered thinking about curriculum as a means to an end.¹⁶ While these ideas eventually ended up realigning the purposes of education to serve future employment, his third criterion, which placed a value on childrearing as a central life activity, resonated with clubwomen around the United States. Spencer's theory suggested that the education of women should eschew the ornamental subjects such as drawing, painting, and music, in order to prepare them for future roles as wives and mothers, an idea that inspired women reformers to promote such endeavors as parent education in the school curriculum.

After 1900, psychologist G. Stanley Hall pressed for a curriculum influenced by Spencer's notion of natural law. Whereas Spencer applied Darwinian thought to society, Hall wanted to become the "Darwin of the mind."¹⁷ Hall is perhaps most well known for creating the field of child study, which he first presented in an 1882 speech to the superintendents of the National Education Association. He followed this with an empirical study of children, "The Contents of Children's Minds," in 1883. The focus of Hall's child study program maintained that physical development and health were the proper foundation of mental and moral development.¹⁸ Therefore, for Hall, health became "the all-controlling factor in directing educational policy, and he feared that early intellectual training might be detrimental to the health of children and even adolescents."¹⁹ Moreover, Hall promoted child study as a means to determine how to teach children and organize curriculum; "Hall's main interest was to use behavioral-science knowledge to create a science of pedagogy."²⁰ Though he abandoned the child-study idea in 1885, Hall picked it up again in the early 1890s when it was embraced by the growing association of women's national organizations who favored child study. As women reformers had interpreted the scientific psychology as a pedagogical enterprise, Hall capitalized on this fervor, "quickly exploiting the ground swell of interest."²¹

Preparations for the Duties of Life

In one notable public opinion Hall challenged the National Education Association's Committee of Ten Report of 1893. The Committee of Ten had been charged with making recommendations for the secondary school curriculum in order to better prepare students for college. The Committee, under the leadership of Charles W. Eliot, the president of Harvard University, recommended four strands of liberal curriculum that made no distinction between those students going to college and those who would not.²² Hall reacted to these recommendations by harboring the accusation that they "enforc[ed] artifacts of both method and matter, and sacrific[ed] the interests of the vast majority who will never go to college."²³ Therefore, Hall's disagreement with the classical curriculum recommendations of the Committee of Ten led him to promote a curriculum that favored differentiation and vocationalism, while he also promoted the education of women for "motherhood and homelife,"²⁴ since a practical education was by definition differentiated along gender lines. Hall proclaimed that schools and other institutions should "make boys more manly and girls more womanly."²⁵ By the second decade of the twentieth century, Hall's position won out over the humanist curriculum proposed by the Committee of Ten, as Spencer's emphasis on self-preservation became for different interest groups the obvious starting point to rework the school curriculum for twentieth-century needs. However, the curriculum reform could not occur without widespread public support, which was something the vast networks of women's associations provided.

Historian of education Steven L. Schlossman refers to G. Stanley Hall as the "intellectual patron saint" of the early PTA.²⁶ Indeed, Hall inspired and later mentored first PTA president Alice McLellan Birney who, like many clubwomen of the late nineteenth century, was well versed in the writings of Hall, Spencer, and kindergarten innovator Friedrich Froebel. Birney perceived the arguments of these theorists as giving credence to women's nurturing role in the school curriculum. Her own education helped shape these views as well. Birney was born in the South in 1858 and had been educated in private academies in the South that trained young women in an ornamental curriculum suitable for the daughters of Georgia's planter class. The curriculum included drawing, painting, needlework, instrumental and vocal music, and language instruction.²⁷ Birney left Marietta to go north to become educated at Mount Holyoke Seminary in 1875. Her year at Mount Holyoke exposed her to a course of study that was known to be comparable to that of the men's institutions. Mount Holyoke's liberal arts curriculum favored Latin, algebra, and geometry, yet still prepared young women for lives of service, teaching, and missionary work.²⁸ After her marriage in 1892 to Theodore Birney, she moved to the affluent town of Chevy Chase, Maryland, where she raised her three daughters. The Washington, D.C. network afforded Birney the opportunity in 1897 to convene a national meeting called the "Congress of Mothers" to bring new information on childrearing, health, and kindergarten work to mothers around the nation. The involvement of noted philanthropist Phoebe Hearst and other female members of

President Cleveland's cabinet helped give the gathering widespread coverage in the nation's newspapers.

At successive annual meetings of the Congress of Mothers Alice Birney shared her views on the importance of theories of Froebel, Spencer, and Hall in directing women's education away from the college and toward the home. She championed child study and united these theorists' ideas into a philosophy that embraced spirituality, the new scientism, and a measure of elitism. In one instance she remarked on Froebel's characterization of scientific motherhood, which had a decidedly spiritual component: "When a mother in her own home applies what she may learn from [Froebel's] books, reverently studying the threefold nature of the immortal being committed to her care, she will acquire the truest, finest culture the world can offer, and then knowledge will be added to love, mother-patience, and gentleness—attributes which transcend all learning."²⁹ Birney was especially fond of mentioning Spencer's influence. In 1905 speech she reminded her audience of a "book written long ago by Herbert Spencer entitled 'Education.' If you think child-study through other mediums than your own limited experience a theory, read that book; it will change your conviction as no argument of mine could ever do."³⁰

Birney was a vigorous promoter of Hall's ideas about a curriculum for women. She sought to make the PTA the embodiment of Hall's theories as he returned to successive annual meetings as a keynote speaker. She helped promote Hall's child study theory and encouraged clubwomen to discuss the new psychology and child study in mothers' clubs and parent-teacher associations. At the opening session of the Congress of Mothers, Hall declared that he saw "large promise" in both education and science through women's child study circles.³¹ He proclaimed child study the "woman's science," a point relished by Birney. PTA leaders, many of them affiliated also with the General Federation of Women's Clubs (GFWC), promoted a science of motherhood with the same mystical fervor as Hall. PTA leaders who wished to devise a school curriculum that taught a gender-specific curriculum to boys and girls echoed Hall's ideas on teaching to gender differences.

As Kliebard points out, Hall's curriculum ideas were drawn less from scientific study than they were "from his metaphysical, even mystical, assumptions about the alleged relationship between the stages in individual development and the history of the human race."³² PTA leaders, in particular, Alice Birney, embraced this mysticism. Her rhetoric and writings reveal the influence of G. Stanley Hall and his ideas; her writings echo his flamboyant and sentimental style that was laden with religious imagery.³³ For example, at the second gathering of Congress of Mothers, Birney declared "the limit of a civilization is found in the aspiration of its motherhood" and that clubwomen should "consider the divine function of maternity, and study its relation to a higher civilization."³⁴ She promoted the notion that women should defer to men in matters of business and worldliness and emphasized traditional gender roles and education for motherhood as a primary goal. Regarding the education of women, Birney placed the ornamental curriculum second to mother-

Preparations for the Duties of Life

hood education, which not only was practical, it was necessary for the welfare of the nation. She explained, “It would be of infinite advantage to the childhood of the world if every young woman could, in the course of her education, have at least one year in a kindergarten training school.”³⁵ Birney’s rhetoric reveals her attempts to place value on maternal knowledge in the school curriculum. In one instance she decried ignorance, pointing out, “I do not mean ignorance of Greek, Latin, higher mathematics, literature or any of the many attractive forms in which learning appeals to us, but ignorance of those things which vitally concern the child’s well-being.”³⁶

In the foreword to Birney’s 1904 book, *Childhood*, Hall declared that it presented “the substance of what parents most need to know in order to make their influence more felt for good upon the rising generation.”³⁷ Birney explained the reason for her book is that “There is no vocation which calls for a higher order of character development than parenthood, and to be a wise as well as good mother or father requires consecration and concentration.”³⁸ As such, her volume was directed at promoting character education for a middle-class readership, whom she identifies as the “great mass of American mothers.”³⁹ Despite the rhetoric of “scientific motherhood” favored by Birney, the book was never intended to be a scientific manual on the care and feeding of infants; rather, it was a character-training guide for the middle-class parent that fused thinking in science, health, and education. Though steeped in elitist assumptions, Birney did attempt to cross class barriers. For instance she explained, “sometimes it happens that the young son of your laundress may be better behaved and have better principles than the son of your rich neighbor.”⁴⁰ Elitism won out, however, for throughout *Childhood* Birney suggested families should spend summers in the mountains or at the seashore, with little reference as to who might be able to afford these sojourns. And, ironically, she contradicted her own emphasis on practical education by advising parents that children should read of Shakespeare, Goethe, Dante, Milton, and Shelley beginning at age ten.⁴¹

As mentioned above, the existing historical scholarship details the efforts of male professional leaders at the expense of investigating the interpretations and applications of women reformers who had a stake in the school curriculum. If we take as a guiding framework the four major competing interest groups outlined by Kliebard—humanists, developmentalists, social efficiency experts, and social meliorists—we note that in terms of the debate among humanists and developmentalists, women reformers sided with developmentalists such as G. Stanley Hall.⁴² They were drawn to the ideas that informed child study and saw an opportunity to make mothering a valued dimension of the school curriculum.

However, women reformers do not fall easily into one or another of these four categories. For example, a closer look reveals that women reformers adapted the social efficiency ideology of botanist and geologist Lester Frank Ward to their goals in the functional curriculum. Ward was influenced by Darwinian theory, but disagreed with Spencer by claiming that humans had the power to intervene intelligently. “Civilization,” Ward argued, “was not achieved by letting cosmic

natural forces take their course, but by the power of intelligent action to change things for the better.”⁴³ The emphasis on prevention over reform became a rally cry for women reformers, especially in their widespread support of the kindergarten. Alice Birney supported the notion of social Darwinism when she remarked upon the collective sigh of relief of men and women who “have carried in their hearts the gnawing fear of inherited evils [and who now] imbibe fresh courage and listen eagerly to the methods by which the evil tendencies may be overcome.”⁴⁴ Therefore, women reformers viewed parenting skills, especially for women, as central in the functional school curriculum, which was intended to prepare students for future duties and obligations. Yet, what women reformers wanted did not enter the school curriculum in the ways they hoped. However, while women reformers were not entirely successful in changing the formal course of study, they did contribute to the notable change in making schools into social welfare institutions.

Implementation of Feminization of the Curriculum

Educational historian B. Edward McClellan argues that the supporters of the functional curriculum lobbied the “first serious challenge” to moral education, which during the nineteenth century had been central in the school curriculum. “As schools began to teach students the new social, academic, and vocational skills required by a complex corporate and bureaucratic order, moral education was forced to compete for a place in an increasingly crowded curriculum.”⁴⁵ However, I argue women reformers did not see a contradiction between the useful curriculum and moral education, since they viewed preparation for parenthood as an important dimension of the relevant curriculum and parenting necessarily included an emphasis on character development.

Therefore, women reformers were not humanists supporting the classical curriculum proposed by the 1893 National Education Association’s Committee of Ten, but developmentalists who combined knowledge in child growth with an adherence to the standards of efficiency. Likewise, they valued the principles of social meliorism, which sought to make a better society through the school curriculum. The members of major women’s organizations thereby infused developments in science—a term they defined broadly—with their maternalist philosophy in an effort to remake schools and the world according to traditional feminine values.⁴⁶ The women leaders at the national and state levels of these various associations were very much like professional men who viewed the school curriculum as a means to express their ideas, hopes, and goals for a better society. And, for nearly all of these reformers, new developments in research on childhood and education influenced curricular decisions.

The women of various major national organizations embraced the language of science, health, psychology, and child study. Their ideas were presented as moral imperatives to clubwomen around the nation through a well-orchestrated network

Preparations for the Duties of Life

of circulars and news articles, in-house publications, annual national and state meetings, and face-to-face gatherings of interested women. For example, in 1899, at the third gathering of the National Congress of Mothers, Alice Birney proclaimed, “National evils require national remedies. I claim, without hesitancy, the greatest evil today is the incompetency, the ignorance of parents, and it is because of this evil that others exist.”⁴⁷ Therefore, women’s work through voluntary associations effected significant change in the school curriculum and helped remake schools into social welfare institutions. However, this interpretation of the functional curriculum emphasized the care of children and not the world of work. In the discussion below I examine changes in relation to health reforms, the impact of efficiency, and attempts at social meliorism in the school curriculum. Each of these overlapping reforms reflects women reformers’ interpretation of male theorists in the early twentieth century and their desire for a more practical school curriculum that valued childrearing as a moral imperative and a means to change society for the better.

Health Reform

Women reformers’ health initiatives had the most significant impact on the school curriculum. Volunteers led the coordination of national efforts through local networks to carry out curriculum reform in the areas of health and sanitation which included initiating health inspections, better-ventilated schools, and school lunches, and putting into place drinking fountains, school nurses, and playgrounds. Among the chorus of reformers during the Progressive era, Birney pointed out the poor ventilation in schools due to “the overcrowding of many of the grades.”⁴⁸ Hygiene was of particular concern to limit the spread of disease. Like many women’s clubs around the nation, these curricular reforms involved school plumbing. For example a club in Illinois reported that it had introduced “bubble fountains and proper toilets for boys” in the early 1900s.⁴⁹

In these vast efforts to reform schools, women reformers did not intend to perpetuate long-term contributions to public education. As in their social welfare reform work they sought to institutionalize their reforms and make them part of legislation.⁵⁰ Around the country, local women’s groups enacted reforms that they handed over to school authorities and boards of education to run. For example, the vacation schools that were begun in Chicago in the 1890s by the woman’s club were turned over in 1911 to the board of education. In Kentucky, the white school improvement leagues had been “placed directly under the control of the state department of education and a paid officer has been placed in the office of the superintendent of instruction, to organize and to supervise the leagues.” And, in Minnesota in 1910, the medical inspector and nurse initiated the PTA were handed over to the school system to maintain.⁵¹ In California in 1916, the clinics started by that state’s Congress of Mothers were taken over by the schools.⁵²

In many cases, women volunteers continued to assist the health professionals.

For example, the PTA's Summer Round-Up Program that began in 1925 was assisted in large part by volunteers to ensure its success in identifying children of school age and bringing them to schools for health inspections. Meals for schoolchildren were offered as early as the 1890s, as recommended by Massachusetts Institute of Technology chemist and home economics innovator Ellen Swallow Richards. By 1913, three dozen cities had meal services, each one having been initiated by women reformers through the PTA and GFWC. In general, by World War I, schools took over the meal service and at this time over one hundred cities had meals for lower class children.⁵³ Women volunteers continued to help administer the meals. Thus, the success of clubwomen was far-reaching in regard to initiating health measures and instituting them in public schools. These changes did not directly have an impact on the formal school curriculum; instead, they influenced the broader curriculum of schools as social welfare institutions. As a result, they brought the work of caring for children into the schools. With nurses, health check-ups, lunches, and other innovations initiated by women reformers and assumed by school districts, the purpose and function of schools was shaped. Women volunteers' health reforms were wide-ranging and effective as they were directed as much at the middle classes as they were the lower classes and immigrants.

Efficiency and Organized Motherhood

Women reformers were able to successfully implement extensive health reforms due to their adherence to the doctrine of efficiency. Although William J. Reese argues that clubwomen effectively staved off total victory by the advocates of efficiency, he overlooks the fact that clubwomen enacted their own brand of efficiency in education to initiate health initiatives and promote parent education.⁵⁴ They were more successful with the former as parent education never became a part of the formal school curriculum in the way reformers like Alice Birney desired. The principles of organization and efficiency led women reformers to study local schools in order to make recommendations to school boards for improvement. In this sense, they were applying the dictates of scientific study to their school reform initiatives. Again revealing the influence of Herbert Spencer, Birney reported in 1900 that organized mothers "have regarded their children *first of all as future mothers and fathers*, next as citizens, and they are demanding that public educational systems adopt their standards of values in the adjustment of curricula."⁵⁵ Women's association leaders therefore encouraged their members to investigate their local schools' curricula, but asked them to refrain from suggesting any particular program or course of study.⁵⁶ This tactic reflected a tacit support of women teachers, many of whom were club members themselves. Club leaders explained to members, "While we have a right to say to the professional educators of the Nation, 'You must give our children the training which will make them efficient and reliable men and women and good citizens,' we must remember that we have not the right

Preparations for the Duties of Life

to say by what text books and by what methods they shall do it. That is a professional matter and must be left to the educators themselves.”⁵⁷ Nonetheless, friction resulted in many of these school-study undertakings. In Pennsylvania one educator remarked that the criticisms regarding the inefficiency of schools were not to be taken seriously since they came mainly from “the old maids in the Civic Club.”⁵⁸ However, success was attained as systematic studies of school conditions prompted educational reforms around the nation. In one notable example, white women of the Atlanta School Improvement Committee in 1913 surveyed the school conditions in black schools and found them deplorable. They appealed to white religious leaders and other white women in the Atlanta area for support. Their efforts resulted in a temporary school building and higher salaries for the black teachers there.⁵⁹

Organization and efficiency were to guide the process of mothering by informing the kind of education that girls and young women were to receive and where it was to take place. With the founding of the GFWC in 1892, first president Charlotte Hawkins Brown commented on the importance of mother education, but suggested it belonged in local clubs rather than in the humanistic curriculum of the schools. “Girls find good elementary instruction in schools, but only practice, such as clubs give can make that instruction available in the battle of life.”⁶⁰ However, a paper at the 1897 annual meeting of the National Education Association by Mary Roberts Smith, a faculty member at Stanford, raised the issue of the role of formal institutions of learning in “Does the Curriculum of Schools and Colleges Fit Young Men and Women for the Duties of Life?”⁶¹ By 1900 Alice Birney was among those women reformers to argue that schools were the proper places for parent education. She argued that the ennui suffered by college women after graduation was reason enough for preparation for childrearing and other family duties. Birney claimed there was a “serious menace in any education which at the close of a four-year period sends a girl to her home discontented with her environment; unkindly critical of her parents and former associates; longing for a career; [and] impatient with the interruptions inseparable from family life.”⁶²

In the early twentieth century, women reformers promoted the idea of parent education in the school curriculum through periodicals and journals and at annual meetings, asking, “Does it not seem strange that training for duties that will devolve upon the vast majority of men and women, in the rearing of children, should be omitted from their education?”⁶³ Women leaders to promote this type of education sought to value the duties of women in the school curriculum and to legitimate the home among other social institutions and “to show that home making is a worth occupation for the most gifted.”⁶⁴ These early calls relied on science to give these areas credibility during a time when the boundaries between amateur and professional were not fully established. As Julia Grant argues, women reformers argued “the proper practice of motherhood demanded esoteric knowledge,” thereby allowing women like Alice Birney to “reconcile their intellectual interests with their everyday lives in the home.”⁶⁵

Parent education in the schools, according to women reformers, necessitated a place for domestic science in the functional curriculum that embraced vocational education and manual training. "The dignity of cooking," said one columnist, is "its scientific value, [which] must be instilled through the public school."⁶⁶ According to Jane Bernard-Powers, clubwomen wanted to see domestic science offered in the schools as a way to ensure the perpetuation of municipal housekeeping reforms into the twentieth century.⁶⁷ Therefore, in order to get a better sense of women reformers' hopes for the school curriculum, we must glimpse at the home economics movement, which began as early as 1899, with the first meeting of the American Home Economics Association in Lake Placid, New York.⁶⁸ The movement was a conservative counter to vocational and commercial education, which was geared to prepare women for the world of work. Since many women reformers were white and middle class, they viewed working women with pity, since they had to support their families through waged labor. Instead, home economics and domestic science were thought to fit women with knowledge for a well ordered home.⁶⁹ However, for the upper classes, one of the main appeals of domestic science programs was to address the "servant problem" of middle-class women of this era, who saw in domestic science a means to prepare young women to work in their homes before they became wives and mothers themselves.⁷⁰

Other women's interest groups, like the National Women's Trade Union League, had different goals in vocational education for women that emphasized preparing young women to support themselves.⁷¹ Early on, the National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education, the principle lobby for vocational education organized in 1906, did not focus on domestic science,⁷² but women reformers were successful in promoting the agenda and eventually home economics received its biggest push after the passage of Smith-Hughes Act in 1918. Smith-Hughes solidified the place of home economics in the school curriculum by providing funding for supervisors at the local, state, and national levels; disseminating prescriptive literature for teachers; and launching further campaigns to cover funding. However, the education for parenthood sought by women reformers of the PTA and GFWC was not a part of, nor did it become integral to the home economics movement, which Bernard-Powers argues ended up becoming nothing more than cooking and sewing classes at the junior high level.⁷³

Women's associations such as the PTA and GFWC were successful in initiating the parent education movement, which crested in the early 1920s. A full discussion of parent education is beyond the scope of this article, however, it is important to note that parent education in large part took place in volunteer groups outside of the confines of the school curriculum which was, as Julia Grant argues, an effective strategy to reach parents.⁷⁴ Though parent education was not a part of the school curriculum for young men and women as Birney had originally hoped, it did promote a goal she originally articulated in 1899: "We are just trying to get parents to feel that they want to know more. We want to get them to go back and go to school again."⁷⁵

Preparations for the Duties of Life

Social Meliorism and Morality

Women reformers also valued an early kind of social meliorism that presaged the activities of Harold Rugg and George S. Counts. Counts and Rugg worked through the 1920s and 1930s to use the schools to create a new social order. Social meliorists viewed schools as the major force for social change and social justice.⁷⁶ Women reformers' vision of social meliorism was more focused on local communities and geared, again, around the valuing of parenting and character education in the school curriculum. The implementation of the kindergarten stands among the few educational innovations that can be counted as the major formal curricular success of women reformers. In 1899, social activist and educator M.A. Cassidy declared, "The schoolhouse is the best crime preventive that has yet been discovered."⁷⁷ Cassidy reiterated a common sentiment of kindergarteners that viewed prevention as preferable to reform efforts; it was a recurring refrain in other women reformers' writings. These educational activists saw in education the possibility to shape the world for the better through a curriculum geared to creating moral citizens and better parents. And, they promoted mothers' meetings or parents' meetings to facilitate communication between home and school. Likewise, the PTA worked for the implementation of kindergartens as part of the public schools around the country based on their reading of the works that supported this innovation.⁷⁸

The functional curriculum had a moral dimension for PTA leaders in that it held the possibility to teach young citizens the proper morals by emphasizing parenthood over future employment. Birney had reminded the public of her belief that "in all professions and vocations the standards are higher than formerly, and the world's call is for trained and skilled workers in every field, save that of parenthood."⁷⁹ The PTA carried this belief to the Department of Women's Associations of the NEA as it shared its commitment to the schools in producing "three results in pupils—knowledge, efficiency, and character; therefore, we will make the effort to introduce into all schools training for the hand as well as for the head, and definite instruction in ethics and civics."⁸⁰ Such calls were discussed more in the meetings of women's associations than they were implemented in schools around the United States.

In 1918, the NEA produced the landmark Cardinal Principles Report, which traced its lineage to Spencer's ideas, and which successfully reoriented the school curriculum toward useful ends. However, the so-called vital life activities that ended up driving the curriculum were not necessarily those that women reformers endeavored to place in the school curriculum, in particular the rearing and discipline of offspring. Instead, the seven cardinal principles—health, command of fundamental processes, vocation, worthy use of leisure time, worthy home membership, citizenship, and ethical character—were nebulous and omitted parenting as a specific end to education yet they included character development.

Women reformers' efforts to get parent education in the public schools dropped off through the 1920s as parent education caught on in voluntary associations and

as the major women's associations retreated from overt school reform work. While associations such as the GFWC turned their attention to community activities, the National PTA continued its work in public education and was successful in promoting moral training and character education in its local affiliates through the twentieth century. Likewise, myriad student clubs such as Camp Fire Girls, Citizen Leagues, and the Boy Scouts took up the charge of character development.⁸¹ Nonetheless, the PTA supported and promoted the seven cardinal principles to its local units as the purposes of education through parent-teacher cooperation. It was a compromise that still valued the home, though it dealt much less explicitly with child rearing and child welfare in the public schools.

Conclusion

This study raises important questions about the goals of women reformers during what is generally considered the major transition in the school curriculum. To date, curriculum history that examines the transition from humanism to utility has generally omitted the voices of women reformers who were influential during this era and who saw in the functional curriculum the potential to value motherhood and the work of childrearing. In general, the ideas of women reformers can be traced to Herbert Spencer and G. Stanley Hall, whose theories appealed to lay women because they valued women's work. Echoing an early argument of Spencer's, one clubwoman claimed that "All education should include in some measure training for self-maintenance. . . of both men and women."⁸² But self-maintenance came to be interpreted by male school leaders as preparation for the world of work, and not education for the welfare of children. Therefore, the goal of women reformers to reorder the values of the school curriculum around parenting was never reached.

However, the PTA and other women's associations were successful in enacting reforms that integrated different interpretations of science during the Progressive era. Herbert Kliebard argues that there were "three seemingly irreconcilable reform thrusts" in the early twentieth century: behaviorism, social efficiency, and social meliorism,⁸³ yet these notions were actually combined in practice by various women's national organizations beginning in the 1890s under their overarching ideology that sought to value childrearing. The PTA popularized G. Stanley Hall's sentimental developmentalist ideas and initiated wide-ranging health reforms in public schools between 1900 and 1920. Efficiency also influenced Congress leaders who wished to remake society by applying principles of order to their work in education. In so doing, women reformers' predated the male educators' social efficiency as applied to the school curriculum, which by 1918 had reached its zenith and "was being recognized as a vital subspecialty within the broader spectrum of education."⁸⁴ Finally, social studies educators George Counts and Harold Rugg later continued the PTA's social meliorist goals through the 1920s and 1930s.

It is important to remember, however, that just as the curriculum changes at the

Preparations for the Duties of Life

turn of the twentieth century were directed by white male elites, the popularization of these notions was in large part accomplished by white, middle- and upper-class women. Therefore, while this historical investigation sheds a new perspective on the transition to the functional curriculum, it omits the voices of those on the margins, in particular the poor and lower classes, immigrants, families of color, and children.

In the Preface to her book, *Bitter Milk*, Madeleine Grumet chides her colleagues in curriculum history for critiquing the patriarchal system of education while still defining schooling in terms of production.⁸⁵ “Dominated by kits and dittos, increasingly mechanized and impersonal, most of our classrooms cannot sustain human relationships of sufficient intimacy to support the risks, the trust, and the expression that learning requires.”⁸⁶ For the women reformers of the turn of the twentieth century, reproduction and its responsibilities in raising children to be productive citizens and supportive parents went hand-in-hand. Grumet’s goal, as was the goal of women reformers of a century earlier, is in grounding the work of the family—however family may be defined—in the public school curriculum. Though a chasm of decades separates Grumet, Noddings, Martin, and others, with their forebears in social and educational reform, the message remains the same. Where are home life and the life of childrearing, a valuing of the whole child over a test-driven curriculum, and the desire to prepare well-rounded citizens in the school course of study? How do we introduce such ideas as the notion of care and counter accusations of dilution of rigor (for these missives are premised on assumptions of a certain kind of subject-centered curriculum that is tested as demanding)? Grumet argues an eloquent echo of a century past that the most fundamental dimension of life, reproducing ourselves, must find expression in the school curriculum and our shared goal of educating future generations.⁸⁷

Acknowledgement

This research was supported by a CITE Department grant at Temple University.

Notes

¹ Mrs. Theodore W. Birney, “The Power of Organized Motherhood to Benefit Humanity,” *The Quarterly Report* 1, no. 1 (1900): 30. Emphasis in original.

² Jane Roland Martin, *The Schoolhome: Rethinking Schools for Changing Families* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992). See also Jane Roland Martin, “Reforming Teacher Education, Rethinking Liberal Education,” *Teachers College Record* 88, no. 3 (1987): 406-410.

³ Nel Noddings, *The Challenge to Care in Schools: An Alternative Approach to Education* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1992). See also Nel Noddings, *Educating Moral People: A Caring Alternative to Character Education* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2002) and Michael S. Katz, Nel Noddings, and Kenneth A. Strike, eds., *Justice and Caring: The Search for Common Ground in Education* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1999).

⁴ This argument is central in Herbert M. Kliebard, *The Struggle for the American Curriculum: 1893-1958* 2nd Edition (New York: Routledge, 1995) and Herbert M. Kliebard, *Schooled to Work: Vocationalism and the American Curriculum, 1876-1946* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1999). For lay influences see Jonathan Zimmerman, "Storm over the Schoolhouse: Exploring Popular Influences upon the American Curriculum, 1890-1941," *Teachers College Record* 100, no. 3 (1999): 602-626.

⁵ See Lawrence A. Cremin, *The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957* (New York: Vintage Books, 1961) and David B. Tyack, *The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1974).

⁶ Nel Noddings argues this point in reference to the K-12 social studies curriculum in "The Care Tradition: Beyond 'Add Women and Stir'," *Theory Into Practice* v. 40, no. 1 (2001): 29-34.

⁷ In this article I focus almost exclusively on white, middle-class women reformers. This is not intended to slight the history of women of color in school reform efforts, but is done so in an effort to demonstrate how ideas about the value of education traveled from white, male educational leaders to lay reformers. In other works I document the history of black women in segregated lay educational associations. See Christine Woysner, "Race, Gender, and the Early PTA: Civic Engagement and Public Education, 1897-1924," *Teachers College Record* 105, no. 3 (2003): 520-544; Christine Woysner, "Black Parent-Teacher Associations and the Origins of the National Congress of Colored Parents and Teachers, 1896-1926," unpublished paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, 2000; and Christine Woysner, "'Valuable and Legitimate Services': Black and White Women's Philanthropy through the PTA," in Andrea Walton, ed., *Women, Education, and Philanthropy* (Bloomington, IN: University of Indiana Press, in press). Also, the Spring 2002 issue of the *Journal of African American History*, edited by V.P. Franklin, is titled "Introduction: Cultural Capital and African American Education," and includes research on black lay associations and public education.

⁸ For studies that explore the effects of lay influences, see Bessie Louise Pierce, *Citizens' Organizations and the Civic Training of Youth* (New York: Scribner's, 1933) and Jonathan Zimmerman, *Whose America? Culture Wars in the Public Schools* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002).

⁹ "Municipal housekeeping," according to Anne Firor Scott, held that women's 'responsibility did not end with the four walls of a home, but extended to the neighborhood, the town, the city." Anne Firor Scott, *Natural Allies: Women's Associations in American History* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1992), 141. See especially Chapter Five, "Self-Improvement, Community Improvement."

¹⁰ To date, scholars have focused on the role of the PTA in social welfare legislation. Such works probe the nationally orchestrated efforts of the PTA and other women's groups in passing mothers' pension legislation and the Sheppard-Towner Maternity and Infancy Act and attest to the power wielded by organized women during this era. These studies also establish how women in urban and rural regions were connected by networks of associations. See, for example, Theda Skocpol, *Protecting Soldiers and Mothers: The Political Origins of Social Policy in the United States* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992); Robyn Muncy, *Creating a Female Dominion in American Reform, 1890-1935* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991); and Molly Ladd-Taylor, *Mother-Work: Women, Child Welfare, and the State, 1890-*

Preparations for the Duties of Life

1930 (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1994). Due to the plethora of research on women's clubs and associations, we have come to learn much about the reform that women enacted through voluntary roles that affected labor, commerce, and politics. However, education was central to the mission of women's associations. For example, in the late nineteenth century women's study clubs served as a kind of university for women when access to such institutions was not widely available. See Karen Blair, *The Clubwoman as Feminist: True Womanhood Redefined, 1868-1914* (New York: Holmes and Meier Publishers, Inc., 1980); Theodora Penny Martin, *The Sound of Our Own Voices: Women's Study Clubs, 1860-1910* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1987); and Anne Ruggles Gere, *Intimate Practices: Literacy and Cultural Work in U. S. Women's Clubs, 1880-1920* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1997).

¹¹ William J. Reese, *Power and the Promise of School Reform: Grassroots Movements during the Progressive Era* (Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1986), 40. See also Woyshner, "Race, Gender, and the Early PTA: Civic Engagement and Public Education, 1897-1924."

¹² Kliebard, *Struggle*, 1. See also William W. Cutler, *Parents and Schools: The 150-Year Struggle for Control in American Education* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999), who discusses this change in relation to parent-teacher associations. This notion was supported by educators of this time who argued, "The school is the transition stage from life in the home to life in the state." George R. Brown, "The Home and the School," *School and Home Education* 18, no. 1 (1898): 16.

¹³ Charles W. Eliot, "Introduction," *Essays on Education, etc. by Herbert Spencer* (New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1949), vii.

¹⁴ Cremin, *Transformation of the School*, 92; Herbert M. Kliebard, *Forging the American Curriculum: Essays in Curriculum History and Theory* (New York: Routledge, 1992), 32.

¹⁵ Herbert Spencer, *Essays on Education, Etc.* (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc. [orig. pub. 1860] 1949), 7.

¹⁶ Kliebard, *Forging*, 39-40.

¹⁷ Cremin, *Transformation of the School*, 101; See also Kliebard, *Forging*, 42.

¹⁸ Dorothy Ross, *G. Stanley Hall: The Psychologist as Prophet* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972), 126, 293, 305, 306.

¹⁹ Kliebard, *Forging*, 42-43.

²⁰ Steven L. Schlossman, "Before Home Start: Notes Toward a History of Parent Education in America," *Harvard Educational Review* 46, no. 3 (1976): 441.

²¹ Ross, *The Psychologist as Prophet*, 131, 260.

²² U. S. Department of Education, "The Report of the Committee of Ten on Secondary School Studies," in *Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1892-1893* (Washington, DC, 1895).

²³ Hall, "G. Stanley Hall's Criticism of the Committee of Ten," in Sol Cohen, ed., *Historical Documents in American Education*.

²⁴ Kliebard, *Struggle*, 41, 93-94.

²⁵ G. Stanley Hall, "Coeducation in the High School," *NEA Proceedings* 1903, 446.

²⁶ Schlossman, "Before Home Start," 441, 445.

²⁷ Sarah Blackwell Guber Temple, *The First Hundred Years: A Short History of Cobb County, Georgia*, second edition (Atlanta, GA: Cherokee Publishing Company, 1980), 418-419.

²⁸ Mabel Newcomer, *A Century of Higher Education for Women* (Washington, DC: Zenger Books, 1959), 53. See also Tiziana Rota, "Between 'True Women' and 'New Women': Mount Holyoke Students, 1837 to 1908 (Ph.D. diss., University of Massachusetts, 1983).

²⁹ Mrs. Theodore W. Birney, "Address of Welcome," *The Work and Words of the National Congress of Mothers First Annual Session* (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1897), 7.

³⁰ Mrs. Theodore W. Birney, "Sympathetic Parenthood," in National Congress of Mothers, *The Child in Home, School, and State: Report of the National Congress of Mothers* (Washington, DC: National Congress of Mothers, 1905), 165.

³¹ G. Stanley Hall, "Some Practical Results of Child Study," *The Work and Words of the First National Congress of Mothers*, 165. For a further exploration of Hall's influence on the Congress of Mothers, see Schlossman, "Before Home Start."

³² Kliebard, *Struggle*, 38.

³³ Ross, *The Psychologist as Prophet*, 139, 268.

³⁴ Mrs. Theodore W. Birney, "Address of Welcome," *The National Congress of Mothers Second and Third Annual Conventions, 1898-1899* (Philadelphia: George F. Lasher, Printer and Binder, 1899), 5.

³⁵ Mrs. Theodore W. Birney, *Childhood* (New York: The Butterick Publishing Company, 1904), 13.

³⁶ Birney, "Sympathetic Parenthood," 167.

³⁷ G. Stanley Hall, "Introduction," in Birney, *Childhood*, vii, viii.

³⁸ Birney, *Childhood*, 2-3.

³⁹ Ibid., 148.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 158.

⁴¹ Ibid., 138-40.

⁴² Kliebard, *Struggle*, see especially the discussion in Chapter One, "Curriculum Ferment in the 1890s," 1-25.

⁴³ Ibid., 21-22.

⁴⁴ Birney, "Address of Welcome," *The Work and Words of the National Congress of Mothers*, 9.

⁴⁵ B. Edward McClellan, *Moral Education in America: Schools and the Shaping of Character from Colonial Times to the Present* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1999), 46.

⁴⁶ Julia Grant, *Raising Baby by the Book: The Education of American Mothers* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 57. Ladd-Taylor defines maternalism as an ideology "rooted in the nineteenth century doctrine of separate spheres and to a presumption of women's economic and social dependence on men." In short, it was a kind of social motherhood. See *Mother-Work*, 2, 3.

⁴⁷ As quoted in Mary Coddington Bourland, "Third National Congress of Mothers," *School and Home Education* 18, no. 10 (1899): 522.

⁴⁸ Birney, *Childhood*, 38. A thorough treatment of the wide-ranging reforms is not possible in this article. See Reese, *Power and the Promise*, for a discussion of women reformers' accomplishments along these lines in four mid-sized cities.

⁴⁹ Dorothy Sparks, *Strong is the Current: History of the Illinois Congress of Parents and Teachers, 1900-1947* (Chicago: Illinois Congress of Parents and Teachers, 1948), 18-19.

⁵⁰ Sheila M. Rothman, *Woman's Proper Place: A History of Changing Ideals and Practices, 1870 to the Present* (New York: Basic Books), 135.

⁵¹ "Summary of State Reports of Joint Committees and Affiliated Organizations [to the Department of School Patrons], 1910-1911," *NEA Proceedings*, 1911, 1098, 1101.

⁵² "Secretary's Minutes, Department of School Patrons," *NEA Proceedings*, 1916, 799.

⁵³ Reese, *Power and the Promise*, 218, 221.

Preparations for the Duties of Life

⁵⁴ Carl Kaestle, "Foreword," in Reese, *Power and the Promise of School Reform*, xvii.

⁵⁵ Mrs. Theodore W. Birney, "The Power of Organized Motherhood to Benefit Humanity," *The Quarterly Report* 1, no. 1 (1900): 30. Emphasis in original.

⁵⁶ General Federation of Women's Clubs, Proceedings, 1905, 201-202; Located at General Federation of Women's Clubs Archives, Washington, DC, hereafter referred to as GFWC.

⁵⁷ Mary Abbot, "Education Committee Report," GFWC Proceedings, 1906, 205; GFWC.

⁵⁸ Issel as quoted in David B. Tyack, *The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1974), 155.

⁵⁹ Gerda Lerner, "Community Work of Black Club Women," *The Majority Finds Its Past* (New York, 1982), 89.

⁶⁰ Charlotte Hawkins Brown, "President's Address," GFWC Convention Records, May 11, 1892; GFWC.

⁶¹ Bourland, *School and Home Education*, 523.

⁶² Birney, "Power of Organized Motherhood," 31-32. Birney was referring to a common debate of this era. For more on this topic, see Joyce Antler, "'After College, What?': New Graduates and the Family Claim," *American Quarterly* 32 (Fall 1980): 409-434.

⁶³ Mary Coddington Bourland, NEA, *Journal of Proceedings and Addresses*, 1897, 864.

⁶⁴ Bourland, *School and Home Education*, 523.

⁶⁵ Grant, *Raising Baby*, 37.

⁶⁶ Cora Stanton Brown, "Domestic Science," *School and Home Education* 19, no. 6 (1900): 297-98.

⁶⁷ Jane Bernard-Powers, *The "Girl Question" In Education: Vocational Education for Young Women In the Progressive Era* (London, UK: The Falmer Press, 1992), 16.

⁶⁸ Ibid., 72.

⁶⁹ Ibid., 28.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 31-32; 66.

⁷¹ Ibid., 55.

⁷² Kliebard, *Struggle*, 121.

⁷³ Bernard-Powers, *The "Girl Question" In Education*, 72, 73, 86.

⁷⁴ Grant, *Raising Baby*, 121.

⁷⁵ Birney, "Work of the Mothers' Congress and Clubs," 252

⁷⁶ Kliebard, *Struggle*, 24.

⁷⁷ M.A. Cassidy, "Home and School," *Education* 19, no. 9 (1899): 541.

⁷⁸ Grant, *Raising Baby*, 35.

⁷⁹ Birney, "Power of Organized Motherhood," 31.

⁸⁰ NEA, *Journal of Proceedings and Addresses*, 1908, 1217.

⁸¹ McClellan, *Moral Education in America*, 51-53.

⁸² Ninth Biennial, 1908, 309, 311; GFWC.

⁸³ Kliebard, *Struggle*, 158.

⁸⁴ Ibid., 99.

⁸⁵ Madeleine Grumet, *Bitter Milk: Women and Teaching* (Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1988), xiv. See also Madeleine Grumet and Lynda Stone, "Feminism and Curriculum: Getting Our Act Together," *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 32, no. 2 (2000): 183-197.

⁸⁶ Grumet, *Bitter Milk*, 56.

⁸⁷ Ibid., 4-5.